1978

Russian Orthodoxy and the challenge of modernity: the case of Archimandrite Makary

Paul Valliere
Butler University, pvallier@butler.edu

The original publication appeared at:

Paul Valliere. "Russian Orthodoxy and the challenge of modernity : the case of Archimandrite Makary" *St Vladimir's Theological Quarterly* 22.1 (1978): 3-15.

Russian Orthodoxy and the Challenge of Modernity: The Case of Archimandrite Makary*

Paul R. Valliere

The challenge of modernity for Orthodoxy as experienced by Archimandrite Makary (Mikhail Iakovlevich Glukharev)[1] is presented here through a brief exposition of Makary's career, its successes, failures and inner tensions. Particular attention is given to Makary's role in the struggle for a Russian-language Bible.

Makary was born in 1792, the son of a priest in the town of Vyazma, received his secondary education at Smolensk Seminary and from 1813 to 1818 studied at St. Petersburg Theological Academy. St. Petersburg Academy during these years was run by a very young and very brilliant new rector, Filaret (Drozdov), a man who would go on to become Metropolitan of Moscow in 1821 and continue in that post for the next forty-six years, the most important Russian hierarch of the Synodal period. After completing the academic course, Makary took monastic vows and quickly began to ascend the ranks. In three days' time he became a *ieromonakh*, and in a month he was enrolled as cathedral *ieromonakh* of the Kievo-Pecherskaia Lavra. Makary's biographer Filimonov sees the hand of Filaret in this upward mobility, arguing that Filaret looked upon Makary as a potential helper in the reform of ecclesiastical schools that had been authorized a few years earlier but was still far from being accomplished in many places.[2] In any case, Makary was headed for a successful career in the schools, and for the black clergy the schools were the training ground for the higher posts in the episcopal hierarchy. In 1819 Makary was dispatched to Ekaterinoslavl as the inspector of the Seminary there. An "inspector" was what we would call a dean of students, and the post was normally the first one held by individuals marked for promotion in ecclesiastical school administration.

* Research on this article was facilitated by a grant from the Council for Research in the Humanities of Columbia University.

[1] On Makary's life and career see D. D. Filimonov, "Materialy dlia biografii osnovatelia altaiskoi missii arkhim. Makariia," *Pravoslavnoe obozrenie*, 1887, May-June, pp. 286-355; 1888, May-June, pp. 403-437; July, pp. 443-489; Aug., pp. 588-623. Also K. V. Kharlampovich, "Bibliograficheskii ocherk,"

But Makary was unhappy in Ekaterinoslavl. He did not get on well with the bishop of the town, Iov (Potemkin), who was irritated by Makary's leniency toward the seminarians and other unconventional behavior. On one occasion, for example, two Quakers who were visiting Russia stopped in Ekaterinoslavl, and Makary joined them for a prayer meeting, an incident that compromised the young inspector in the eyes of Bishop Iov. Makary was soon asking to be transfered and in 1821 moved to the Seminary of Kostroma where, indeed, he also received a promotion and became rector.[3] For some reason, however, the twenty-nine year old Makary was also unsatisfied with this enviable position. Beginning in 1823 he was writing Metropolitan Filaret about his desire to retire from academic and administrative responsibilities and become a resident monk at the Kievo-Pecherskaia Lavra in Kiev. Filaret tried to dissuade him, apparently by offering to promote him again. In 1824 Makary was summoned to Petersburg and an episcopacy was offered to him. But he insisted on his desire to retire to the monastery and in 1825 was allowed to do so.[4] First he went to Kievo-Pecherskaia Lavra, but finding the place too crowded and noisy for his taste, he moved to Kitaevskaia Hermitage outside the city and finally to a rural monastery in Kursk Province, the Glinsky Bogoroditssky Optinsky Hermitage, where he placed himself under the tutelage of an elder (*starets*) named Filaret. In this Filaret, as opposed to the other one, he seemed to have found what he was looking for. From Glinsky Hermitage he wrote: "This is a school of Christ; this is one of the bright spots on the globe, where, in order to enter, one must diminish oneself to the point of becoming a little child of Christ." [5]

in *Pis'ma arkhimandrita Makariia Glukhareva, osnovatelia Altaiskoi missii,* ed. by K. V. Kharlampovich (Kazan: Tsentral'naia tipografiia, 1905), pp. 1-65. The "Bibliograficheskii ocherk," which is separately paginated, is hereafter referred to as "Kharlampovich."

For brief accounts see N. B.—(v), "Makarii (v mire Mikhail Iakovlevich Glukharev)," *Entsiklopedicheskii slovar'*, ed. by F. A. Brokgauz and I. A. Efron (St. Petersburg, 1896), Vol. XVIII, pp. 398-399, and "Makarii, (1) arkhimandrit . . . .," *Bol'shaia Entsiklopediia,* ed. by S. N. Iuzhakov (St. Petersburg, 1903), Vol. XII, pp. 504-505.

[2] Filimonov, p. 297.

[3] On relations between Makary and Bishop Iov see Filimonov, pp. 298-301 and Kharlampovich, pp. 5-8. The Quakers were the Englishman William Allen and the Franco-American Stephen Grillet (Etienne Grellet de Mobillier). Excerpts from Grillet's diary account of the trip through Russia appeared as "Zapiski Kvakera o prebyvanii v Rossii. 1818-1819," ed. by I. Osinin, *Russkaia starina,* IX (1874), pp. 1-36. The meeting with Makary is described on pp. 32-33.

[4] Filimonov, pp. 312-316.

[5] *Ibid.,* p. 316.

Understandably, not much was heard from Makary during the years when he was busy becoming a little child of Christ in Kursk Province. His spiritual father, the *starets* Filaret, was a person involved in the monastic revival that had begun in late eighteenth-century Russia with the work of the monk Paissy Velichkovsky.[6] The substance of the movement was the revival of interest in the mystical and ascetical literature of the Christian East, the so-called *Philokalia* (in Slavonic, *Dobrotoliubie*), which Paissy and his successors undertook to translate from Greek into Slavonic for distribution and use in Russia. This was a creative path of development in modern Orthodoxy, and Makary in a small way was a part of it.

Meanwhile, however, Makary was missing some very important developments that were going on in the wider Church world from which he had so prematurely withdrawn. A general shift was taking place in Church affairs from the age of reform that characterized the middle period of Alexander's reign to a period of reaction in the latter days of Alexander's and most of Nicholas' reign. While Makary was a student at St. Petersburg Academy that institution and some of its leading faculty members, including the rector Filaret, stood at the very center of the Church reform movement. The reforms in ecclesiastical schools authorized between 1808 and 1814 marked the beginning of the cultivation of serious theological scholarship by the Russian Church. Allied with these reforms was the organization of the Russian Bible Society, modeled on the contemporary British and Foreign Bible Society of London and pervaded by the same pietistic enthusiasm that motivated the international missionary societies in England, Europe and America to carry the Gospel to foreign parts and, in the process, to translate it into heathen languages. In Russia, however, the main task of the Bible Society was first to effect the translation of the Bible into Russian, for theretofore it had existed only in Church Slavonic. The St. Petersburg Academy was the headquarters for the translation project. Filaret himself was deeply involved, and above all Gerasim Pavsky, a young scholar (four years older than Makary) who from 1814 held the newly created chair of Hebrew language in the Academy and can rightly be called the first Hebraist in modern Russian theology.[7]

[6] Kharlampovich, pp. 9-10. On *starets* Filaret (1773-1841) see under "Filaret," *Russkii biograficheskii slovar'* (St. Petersburg, 1902), "Faber-Tsiavlovskii," p. 106.

[7] On Pavsky (1787-1863) see Arsenii Vol'skii, "Pavskii, Gerasim Petrovich, protoierei," *Russkii biograficheskii slovar'* (St. Petersburg, 1902), "Pavel, prepodobnyi—Petr (Ileika)," pp. 103-109. The fullest account of the history of the Russian Bible is I. A. Chistovich, *Istoriia perevoda Biblii na russkii iazyk*, 2d ed. (St. Petersburg: Tipografiia M. M. Stasiulevicha, 1899).

All of these reform activities, of course, created conflict within the Russian Church as well as in the State. The project of translating the Bible into Russian was especially controversial, as it involved the use of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, which differed significantly from the Septuagint Bible that had been the basis of the Slavonic translation and enjoyed prestige throughout the Eastern Christian world as "the" Bible *par excellence.* Translation also raised problems of Church authority by placing the text of Scripture into the hands of literate laity and because many of the leaders of the Russian Bible Society and its projected missionary activities were lay people and not black clergy. Already before 1820 obstacles to the institutionalization of Church reform had arisen, and these became virtually insurmountable after the accession of Nicholas I in 1825. In 1826 the Bible Society was closed altogether. Filaret, Pavsky and other reformers could thereafter prosecute their causes only very cautiously, if at all. Pavsky privately continued to translate the Hebrew scriptures into Russian, but he lived under suspicion and after the middle 1830's virtually in retirement. In 1839 the famous Pavsky Affair started when among the students of St. Petersburg Academy lithographed copies of Pavsky's translations began to circulate. Although Pavsky was later (1844) acquitted by a Synodal investigation of personal responsibility for the *samizdat,* he was humiliated by being made to write a confession of loyalty to the Synodal administration of the Church. A period of repression of all reform was unleashed. Even Metropolitan Filaret, occupying the highest ecclesiastical post in Russia, was penalized in the aftermath of the Pavsky Affair by being excluded from the meetings of the Holy Synod, the governing body of the Russian Church of which he as Metropolitan of Moscow was a permanent member, an exclusion that lasted for many years. As for the Russian Bible, it had to wait for a new Tsar and another age of reform. It finally appeared between 1860 and 1875.

In 1829, after four years of seclusion in the Glinsky Hermitage, Makary reemerged into the public world of the Russian Church with another request to the Synod for a change of assignment. He petitioned for permission to heed the call of a distant Russian bishop, Evgeny (Kazantsev) of Tobolsk, for Russian monks to come to the Tobolsk region of Western Siberia to do missionary work among the non-Christian natives of the area. Makary presented himself for duty and the Synod agreed to it. In 1829 he went to Tobolsk and after some months of preparation left for the town of Biisk, located in Tobolsk Province near the Altai Mountains on the edge of Turkestan. There he established a mission station and in the next few years two more in the villages of Maima and Ulala, deep in the Altai.[8] In this new

[8] Filimonov, pp. 316-325; Kharlampovich, pp. 10-14.

work Makary showed all the enthusiasm and energy of a man who had found his mission. But it is crucial to note that this step towards a firm personal vocation, this step back into the public work of the Orthodox Church, took Makary ever farther away from the center of Church life than he had been in the monastery in Kursk Province, not to speak of the ecclesiastical schools. Makary found his work at the extremity of the Church world, thousands of miles removed from the heartland of Russian Orthodoxy and the intellectual and leadership circles of the Church. Indeed, Biisk is even far from Tobolsk—almost eight hundred miles! Makary's flock in this remote post was not even Russian. It was composed mainly of scattered Turkic tribes, many still pagan and the others largely Muslim. Most of the Russians in a place like Biisk were army officers, cossacks, political exiles or deported convicts. Even in Tobolsk, where there were some old Siberian Russian families and townsfolk, conditions were very much those of a frontier.

The attitude of Metropolitan Filaret toward Makary's new ventures can be seen in a letter he wrote to Makary in Tobolsk. Once in Tobolsk Makary apparently had some second thoughts about staying, not because he wanted to go back to Russia but because he was tempted to go further East, to Irkutsk, where a similar missionary effort was being mounted and where he apparently had some personal contacts. Filaret wrote urging him to stay in Tobolsk Province. Filaret's tone was minatory: " 'More than anyone else in the Holy Synod His Holiness Vladimir knows you and your life and loves and protects you. But even he, before your last move to the Glinsky Hermitage, expressed doubt as to whether you would be steadfast there. His doubt was confirmed by experience. And with you now setting out onto a distant path he wanted to know: what if again there should come to light events that confirm this doubt? You yourself can imagine what difficulty would arise for you and the good cause you are serving.' "[9] Clearly, as the Metropolitan reviewed the career of Archimandrite Makary, his purposeful, administrative mind was irritated by the record of fits, starts and changes. He must have suspected that the project in Turkestan would not be the end of it, as indeed it was not.

In any case Makary decided to stay in Tobolsk Province. He got down to the serious business of mission in 1830 and continued his work from this base for the next fourteen years, leaving only in 1844, three years before his death. During that period of time he baptized about 1700 men, women and children including both Russians and natives. The mission that he left behind continued to exist and grow down into the twentieth century. In 1905 it was serving a community of about 25,000 people. By then the Altai Mission was recognized

[9] Filimonov, p. 325.

throughout the Russian Church as an exemplary enterprise and was widely emulated.[10]

Our concern here, however, is not with the Altai Mission as a whole but with the dynamics of Makary's piety. What is most striking about the latter is the degree of continuity it shows with the reformist Biblical and missionary piety that characterized the initiatives of the St. Petersburg Academy in his student days, the days of Gerasim Pavsky, the Bible Society and the young Filaret. It is almost as if that piety, having been repressed at the center of the Church, emigrated to Turkestan in the person of Makary and recreated itself on the frontier. Early on in his missionary work Makary became convinced that to prosecute his mission successfully he had to build on and use the customs and language of the native peoples among whom he found himself. After learning several of the Turkic dialects he petitioned the Holy Synod to allow him to translate portions of the Bible, liturgy and prayers into the dialect which he had chosen to be the standard one of his mission. The permission was granted without objection.[11] In the next few years Makary translated most of the New Testament, many Psalms and other portions of the Old Testament into the dialect and compiled a comparative dictionary of the Altai dialects. This approach to mission clearly shows the influence of the Western missionary societies of the day with which Makary would have become familiar through the Russian Bible Society.

By 1835, however, Makary was already dreaming bigger thoughts stimulated by these beginnings. The translation of portions of Scripture into a "heathen" dialect seemed to awaken in him afresh and in a directly personal way the project of translating the Bible into Russian. After all, if the Bible could exist in Tartar, why not Russian as well? In 1835 in a letter to one of his old friends in Ekaterinoslavl Makary wrote: "I am still intending to get down to work on the study of the Hebrew Bible. This desire arose not long ago from contact I had in the course of my ministry with unbaptized Jews, and although I scarcely hope to read through all the books of the Old Testament in the Hebrew language before I die, still I think that the Lord, who has not made vain my efforts to become acquainted with the unlettered dialects of half-savage tribes, will give me some issue in the renewal of the studies that I began in seminary and continued in the academy, but which long ago I broke off, something I now heartily repent of."[12] Makary applied himself to his new project with extraordinary energy. To say the least, resources were scarce in Siberia and Central Asia, but Makary found them—and in surprising places. He sought out

[10] Kharlampovich, p. 36.

[11] *Ibid.*, pp. 16, 24-25.

[12] Filimonov, pp. 435-436.

Decembrist exiles in Tobolsk who took an interest in his project and supplied him with a few Western European sources, such as the Swiss Protestant Jean Frédéric Osterwald's annotated edition of the French Bible. He also made use of the German orientalist Rosenmüller's scholia on the Old Testament.[13] By 1837 Makary had a complete translation of the Book of Job ready, for in that year he sent a copy of the translation to the Holy Synod and a second copy to Tsar Nicholas himself, urging that the material be published as an aid to the study of the Bible in Church schools and missions. Receiving no response from either authority, Makary nevertheless pushed ahead with his project and in 1839 sent a translation of the Book of Isaiah to the Synod with a second copy to the Tsar.[14]

The boldness of these moves on Makary's part can hardly be overemphasized. The whole Church knew the sad history and delicate politics of the Russian Bible. Makary knew, too. Indeed, he was personally acquainted with some of the principals of the drama. How could he possibly have thought that what the Metropolitan of Moscow was unable to effect could be effected by an archimandrite making his career in the Altai mountains? But this is just what he seems to have thought, as shown by his supreme outrage, the direct appeal to the Tsar. At this time in the history of the Russian Church ecclesiastical affairs were so tightly controlled by the Synod, a state secretariat for religion, that even bishops and metropolitans could not make direct petitions to the Tsar about Church business but were required to go through the Synod, whose chief bureaucrat, a layman, alone had the right of dealing directly with the sovereign. Makary in his headiness and enthusiasm made light of all such good form. His letters to the Tsar are startling documents. Written in the submissive and formal style customary for missives to a Tsar, they still make a very blunt plea for a Russian Bible, and in places they are marked by a shocking tone of familiarity. Near the end of his second letter to Nicholas Makary writes: "I am offering the Divine book of the Prophet Isaiah to Your Imperial Excellency simply as spiritual *khleb-sol'*." [15] *Khleb-sol'* ("bread and salt") is hospitality that a host offers someone who comes to his house. Makary seems for a moment to have forgotten who the master of the house really was!

[13] Kharlampovich, p. 40; Filimonov, p. 445. The Decembrists were P. S. Bobrishchev-Pushkin, M. A. Fonvizin, and P. N. Svistunov. See K. Kharlampovich, "Makarii Glukharev i tobol'skie dekabristy," *Russkii arkhiv*, 1904, I, Feb., pp. 235-243.

[14] See Makary's letters to Tsar Nicholas accompanying his translations of Job and Isaiah, *Pis'ma arkhimandrita Makariia Glukhareva, osnovatelia Altaiskoi missii*, ed. by K. V. Kharlampovich (Kazan, 1905), Nos. 74-75, pp. 188-198.

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 197.

In 1839 Makary made a visit to St. Petersburg and Moscow, his first trip back to Russia after nine years in Asia. The purpose of the trip was to raise funds for his mission and also to receive some medical attention. But of course Makary also used the opportunity to see what he could do to further his Bible project. During his visit of six months in Moscow Makary stayed with Metropolitan Filaret, with whom more than anyone else he had been in correspondence about his translations. In any case, once back in Asia in 1840 he wrote a long letter to the Holy Synod in which he reported hearing during his recent stay in Petersburg that his Isaiah manuscript had been handed over to the censor for review, and he asked what had become of it.[16] In a reply from the Synod in the spring of 1841 he was sternly informed that by dabbling in the business of the Russian Bible he was overstepping the bounds of his calling and that he should desist immediately.[17]

After this rebuke there began a period in Makary's life that shows all the signs of a serious vocational and emotional crisis. Certainly there were no new problems in the Altai Mission that were oppressing Makary, although his health and eyesight were deteriorating, and he needed a rest. Still, the request that he made to the Synod late in 1842 was a surprising one. He petitioned the Synod to allow him to retire from the Altai Mission and make a pilgrimage to Jerusalem so that he could pray at the Holy Sepulchre before he died. The Synod, unconcerned as ever with such flights of transcendence, granted Makary permission to retire but refused him the pilgrimage, appointing him instead the prior of a provincial monastery in central Russia (Bolkhov). This outcome produced severe " 'agitation of mind and conflicting thoughts' " and left him in a " 'state of sadness,' " as a biographer reports his words.[18] He had no choice but to accept it and returned to Russia in the summer of 1844. Receiving permission to spend three months in Moscow before taking up his new responsibilities, Makary stayed not with Filaret but with A. N. Golitsyn. He left after only two months, and one of his biographers speculates that Filaret may have asked him to leave because it was the time of the culmination of the Pavsky Affair.[19] The rest of Makary's days were spent in the Bolkhov monastery, and they were not numerous. He died on May 17, 1847.

Mystery and rumor surround Makary's request to go to Jerusalem after leaving the Altai. Both of Makary's biographers, one of whom (Filimonov) had personal contact with Makary during the latter's

[16] *Ibid.*, No. 78, pp. 201-210.

[17] Kharlampovich, p. 38.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 35.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 49.

stay in Moscow in 1844, adduce evidence hinting that Makary may have been contemplating going abroad to arrange for the publication of a Russian Bible in Europe. Neither biographer reports this as a sure thing, although both heartily suspect that the fear of some such move was the main reason that the Synod and Filaret kept Makary at home.[20] At least Metropolitan Filaret felt strangely about the proposed pilgrimage, although there was certainly nothing unorthodox about a monk wanting to pray in the Holy Land. In a letter to a third party in which he mentions Makary, Filaret wrote: " 'Father Makary had some very peculiar thoughts, such as the thought of going abroad and dying somewhere in obscurity, which was not put into effect because the night before the beginning of the journey he took ill and died shortly thereafter.' " [21] It is impossible to say for sure what Makary had in mind after leaving the Altai. Whether he knew he was dying and wanted the experience of seeing the earthly Zion in preparation for the heavenly one, whether he intended to go to Europe either before or after Jerusalem to arrange for the publication of his translations, or whether he wanted to die in obscurity away from the center of the Russian Church just as he once chose to live and work there, he must have been reacting primarily to his failure to win over the center and trying to come to terms with it in a spiritually definitive way.

Three questions need to be raised about the piety inspiring the career just outlined in order to analyze it in terms of Orthodoxy and the challenge of modernity. What was reformist or otherwise innovative about Makary's piety? What was traditional about it? And, how did the reformist and traditional elements interact?

For our purposes "reformist" piety means piety which tries to deal creatively with the social, cultural and spiritual challenges posed by the emergence of the modern world and which is even open to reshaping itself for this purpose. Makary's piety was reformist in this sense in at least three respects: (1) advocacy of a vernacular Bible, (2) use of modern Western scholarly methods and resources for the interpretation of Scripture, and (3) openness to contact and communication with other religions in working out Orthodoxy's vocation in modern Russia. Each of these aspects of Makary's piety should be seen against the background of early Russian modernization. The preoccupation with the role of the vernacular in the Church was connected with the emergence of the Russian language in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century as a culture-building force in its own right and a literary instrument of world significance. In his letters on the need for a Russian Bible Makary called attention to

[20] Filimonov, pp. 594, 614-616; Kharlampovich, pp. 40-41.

[21] Quoted in Kharlampovich, p. 40.

the great achievements of Russian literature in his day. He saw here a crucial challenge for Orthodoxy because in his opinion the voice of Russian literature was a secular, even profane voice.[22] He feared that Orthodoxy would be left behind in the ongoing development of Russian culture. In other words, Makary can be said to have seen the need of "home missions"; he no longer took Russia's Orthodoxy for granted. Makary's readiness to use Western Biblical scholarship, including even some of the radical sources,[23] should be seen in the light of the intimate mutual involvement of Russia and Europe from the eighteenth century on. This involvement meant enormous challenges for Orthodoxy, since, as we must always remind ourselves, the *corpus christianum* of which the Russians felt themselves to be a part did *not* include the Christian countries north of the Balkans and west of the Neman and the Carpathians. Finally, the directness and enthusiasm of Makary's personal contacts with religionists of other traditions—Quakers, Jews, Muslims and others—as well as his great passion for Hebrew studies must be seen in terms of the unprecedented problems of social, political and spiritual integration posed by the rise of the modern Russian Empire, marked as it was by westward, eastward and southward expansion. The question of the historical destiny of the Imperial project and its Church was intimately bound up with the religious challenges posed by the incorporation of millions of alien religionists: Roman Catholic Poles and Lithuanians, Baltic Protestants, Jews and Muslims. The challenge was made particularly pointed by the high degree of cultural and theological sophistication of some of these groups. For the Russian Orthodox majority with its great ignorance of the world and stay-at-home tradition, this posed very new problems, and Makary was struggling with them.[24]

[22] See *infra*, n. 25.

[23] Filimonov reports (p. 594) that he had a conversation with Makary about Strauss' *Leben Jesu* in Moscow in 1844.

[24] Makary drafted a detailed proposal for an Orthodox missionary society, the full text of which was published decades after it was written: Arkhimandrit Makarii Glukharev, *Mysli o sposobakh k uspeshneishemu rasprostraneniiu Khristianskoi very mezhdu Evreiiami, Magometanami i iazychnikami v rossiiskoi derzhave*, s predisloviem Sviashchennika S. V. Strakhova (Moscow: Tipografiia A. I. Snegirevoi, 1894). Also published serially in *Pravoslavnyi blagovestnik*, 1893-1894.

Throughout his career Makary was particularly interested in contacts with Jews. Filimonov reports (p. 310) that as rector of Kostroma Seminary Makary spent 150 rubles to supply a baptized Jew of English origin named Moritz with a copy of the Hebrew Scriptures and a lexicon, apparently for missionary purposes. Kharlampovich reports (pp. 49-50) that during his stay in Moscow in 1844 Makary corrected his translations of the Old Testament with the help of a Jewish scholar (identified only as "Adam").

Turning to ask what was still traditional in Makary's piety one does not have to go very far before realizing that most of his piety remained extremely traditional. Even the changes evident in the reformist elements enumerated above would appear to lie more in the form in which his piety was expressed than in the content. For Makary the existential problem was not whether to be Orthodox or not. The problem was what to do with the Orthodoxy to which he was committed, how to express it in action. But the fact that answers to this question did not come naturally, that they required unusual and often strained efforts, is a sign that Makary's piety was already in some sense new, although not in an ideological or doctrinal sense. Thus, when Makary pondered the relationship of Orthodoxy to the alien religionists of the Empire he thought still in terms of ways to bring them to the true light of Orthodoxy. Ideas of a synthesis of religions or religious pluralism, ideas that involve some degree of relativization of Orthodoxy, were far from his mind. Nor did he think that a vernacular Bible or the use of Western Biblical scholarship would fundamentally alter the content of Orthodox truth. This being the case, one might be tempted to conclude that Makary, thoroughly traditional himself, differed from more conservative Orthodox contemporaries only in arriving at a different subjective attitude, a different emotionality in relation to traditional values. This was a consequential change, to be sure, and it gave rise to the peculiar pathos of Makary's career: the fact that Makary had to be a failure in terms of the Orthodox institutions of his day in order to bear witness to an Orthodoxy adequate to his day. He and his Orthodoxy were lost at the center of the Church; they were found on the periphery. But having established this much, would it not seem that further discussion of traditional elements in Makary's piety would be merely an exercise in discovering the obvious?

We submit that there is still more to be said. In Makary's piety we have a clear example of a general phenomenon in the history of religious traditions in the modern world that we propose to call *the release of charisma*. By this is meant a change in tradition that affects its inner content in discernible ways but at the same time must be strictly distinguished from another, more widely recognized type of religious change under modern conditions, namely the importation into tradition of values that had no place or very minimal place in the classical expressions of tradition. By the release of charisma we mean the emergence of specific traditional values with an intensity, a dynamism and a range of uses uncharacteristic of them in the normal course of traditional development. Often this is a release from routinized patterns of expression or from a state of latency. That which is released may be called "charisma" because the changes to which it gives rise

affect not so much the classical conceptuality of tradition but the conceptuality and dynamics of practice. The values are charismatic in that they inspire, orient and give meaning to social action, "social action" in this context meaning action that builds or sustains community.

In Makary's case the release of charisma is particularly evident in his approach to the Scriptures. The charisma of Scripture is manifest in the passionate, quasi-messianic fervor that Makary felt for the Russian Bible and, even more, for the Hebrew original. Makary's efforts for the Bible were pervaded by a mood of intense historical expectation of a new earthly embodiment of God's light. Quoting St. John, "Children, the time is late," Makary wrote in a letter to Metropolitan Filaret: "If the time was already late then, is it not late now? . . . Remember the parable of Jesus Christ about the five wise virgins and the five foolish virgins, about the sudden coming of the Bridegroom to the wedding feast, about the extinguished lamps, about the lamps made ready and dressed; and say to yourself: has the Russian people not by now matured for marriage with the Wisdom of God, but rather matured for lawless union with her rival, the alien and cunning woman . . .?," the latter woman apparently signifying the secular spirit of Russian literary and artistic culture.[25] Toward the end of the same letter he wrote: "May the Holy Spirit, who descended upon the holy disciples and Apostles of our Lord and granted them the power to preach the mighty acts of God in various living languages, inspire our Most Pious Sovereign with the good and strong thought and jealous longing to create by means of the sacred hands of the Pastors of the Russian Church, out of the purest substance of the Russian word, the edifice of the Wisdom of God and the Ark of God's Word, complete as according to the plan of the Heavenly Architect, and for this great good deed on behalf of the whole Church of Christ may His [i.e., the Tsar's] Name be written in Heaven. For on earth there exists not only Babylon but also Zion; and for what Babylon praises not there will be glory in Zion." [26] Makary's Biblicism was pervaded by a passion for Zion also in a more literal sense. He looked forward with joy and expectation to the fulfillment of St. Paul's prophecy of the salvation of the Jews, an extremely important motif in Makary's religious outlook. As Makary put it: "The lamp of the Hebrew Bible will be adorned like a bride on her wedding day and, more than all the other lamps derived from it, shine in the church of our Lord Jesus Christ, when for the first time the Christian Church will hear and in its festive liturgy resound with the language of the Prophet Moses: Bereshith bara Elohim et-hashamaim va et-haarets;

[25] *Pis'ma*, No. 63, pp. 135-136.

[26] *Ibid.*, pp. 143-144.

ve haarets tohu va bohu, va Ruach Elohim merachepheth alpne hamaim. Va yomer Elohim: Yehi Or, va yehi Or." [27] Makary's Biblical ideas here are traditional, including the idea of the Wisdom of God as almost a fourth hypostasis of the Godhead: but they emerge in his piety with a sharpness, intensity and practical, historical agenda that must be judged relatively novel in Russian Orthodox piety.

The charisma of the wilderness is another prominent feature of Makary's piety. The mystique of the wilderness, of the desert (*pustynia*) as the most fruitful place in God's world for mystical and ascetical cultivation, pervades Eastern Christian monastic literature, and we have noted that Makary participated in the revival of this literature during his years of retirement in the Glinsky Hermitage. The revival itself is an example of the release of charisma and should be interpreted in the context of the coming of modernity to Russia. But we are interested in the even sharper and more radical appropriation of the mystique of the wilderness that is obvious in Makary's *anachoresis* to the Altai. Many monks in Russia were forming themselves as *pustynniki*, but most of them were doing so in the relative security of monasteries in the Russian heartland where the type of the *pustynnik* could be realized in routinized and conventionalized ways. It is not suggested here that there was no religious integrity in these paths. Our point is that in the case of Makary we see a radicalization of wilderness piety in that he took it literally and sought a real wilderness in which to cultivate it, with the result that new paths of consequential social action for the Russian Church were created.

Archimandrite Makary has remained an attractive figure for Orthodoxy down to the present day chiefly because of the release of charisma evident in him. What was and is compelling about him derived not from objective accomplishments but from his spiritual example. Makary's translations of the Old Testament were not as significant in the long run as the work of better equipped scholars, such as Pavsky; and the achievements of the Altai Mission, while notable, were not really exceptional and certainly not crucial for the historical destiny of Orthodoxy in Russia. It was rather when Makary joined together in his own person the newly found charisma of Scripture with the traditional but radicalized charisma of the wilderness, and with that combination of forces invaded the center of the Church from his base on the frontier, that he became what he has remained: one of the most fascinating, challenging and authentic monks of modern Orthodoxy.

[27] *Ibid.*, pp. 134-135.